

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 4, 2006. Claims 37-54 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 37-54 were rejected. In order to expedite prosecution of this Application, Applicants amend Claims 37, 38, 40, 42, 44-49 and 51-54, and Applicants add new Claims 55-61. Thus, Claims 37-61 remain pending in the Application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 37-39, 43-45, 50-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,466,203 issued to Van Ee (hereinafter "*Van Ee*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,044,445 issued to Tsuda et al. (hereinafter "*Tsuda*"). Claims 40-42, 46-49 and 53-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Van Ee* in view of *Tsuda* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,024 issued to Robotham et al. (hereinafter "*Robotham*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 37, 45 and 52 are independent. Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Van Ee* nor *Tsuda*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests the limitations of independent Claims 37, 45 and 52. For example, *Van Ee* appears to disclose an apparatus 100 having a display 102 for displaying graphical information, a frame buffer 112 coupled to the display 102 for storing information content shown on the display 102, and a modem 114 for connecting to the Internet (*Van Ee*, column 3, lines 44-66, figure 1). *Van Ee* also recites:

Such handheld devices provided with the auto-zoom feature let the user retrieve graphical information, e.g., a web page or streamed video that is stored, e.g., as a bitmap, in the display's framebuffer or another cache.

(*Van Ee*, column 2, lines 31-35). *Van Ee* does not appear to disclose or even suggest that the data received by the handheld device from the network is "bitmap image data" as recited by Claims 37, 45 and 52. To the contrary, web pages and streamed video as indicated by *Van Ee* must presumably be decoded/processed after receipt by the handheld device in order to generate bitmap information storable in a framebuffer of the handheld device. *Tsuda* appears to be relied on to purportedly disclose reading data out of a framebuffer at an

appropriate refresh rate for display on a display device (Office action, page 3 (*Tsuda*, column 1, lines 54-65)). Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Van Ee* nor *Tsuda*, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests "a display network interface operable to receive bitmap image data of the image from the network" as recited by amended Claim 37.

Independent Claim 45, as amended, recites "receiving, via a network interface of a display device communicatively coupled to a network, bitmap image data," and independent Claim 52, as amended, recites "means for receiving, via a display device communicatively coupled to a network, bitmap image data of the image." At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 37, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 45 and 52 are also patentable over the cited references. Support for the amendments to Claims 37, 45 and 52 may be found at least at page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 29, of Applicants' specification as originally filed.

Claims 38-44, 46-51 and 53-54 depend respectively from independent Claims 37, 45 and 52. At least for the reasons discussed above, independent Claims 37, 45 and 52 are in condition for allowance. Further, at least for Claims 40-42, 46-49 and 53-54, *Robotham* does not appear to remedy at least the deficiencies of *Van Ee* and *Tsuda* discussed above. Therefore, for at least this reasons, Claims 38-44, 46-51 and 53-54 are also patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 37-54 be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS


Applicants add new Claims 55-61. New Claims 56 and 57 depend from new independent Claim 55, and new Claims 59-61 depend from new independent Claim 58. Applicants respectfully assert that new Claims 55-61 recite features and limitations not found in the cited art. Support for new Claims 55-61 may be found at least at page 5, line 10 to page 6, line 29, and page 17, lines 17-24 of Applicants' specification as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these new claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

An RCE filing fee of \$790.00 is believed due. The Director of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company the amount of \$790.00 to satisfy the RCE filing fee. If, however, Applicants have miscalculated the fee due with this RCE, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this RCE to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,



James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: March 2, 2007

Correspondence to:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884